

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/913,664

Applicant(s)

FAUSTMAN, DENISE L.

Examiner

Vera Afremova

Art Unit

1651

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Vera Afremova.

(3)_____.

(2) David G. O'Brien.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 24 August 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: all.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The contents of declaration by Denise L. Faustman filed 3/24/2004 has been discussed as related to the claimed subject matter. The comparative data are presented and/or argued for the cellular materials different from the claimed cellular materials and from the prior art cellular materials. The scope of comparative data presented does not commensurate with the scope of the claims. For example: the presented results are related to the effects of the prior art toxic substances and enzymes on viability of the T cell suspensions (tables 1-4). Yet, the instant claims are not limited to the use of T cell suspensions. Besides, the cited prior art cellular materials are tissues including skin tissues that are within the scope of the instant claims..